

Applic. No. 10/689,973

Amdt. dated June 6, 2006

Reply to Office action of March 8, 2006

Remarks/Arguments:

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 2-7 and 10-20 remain in the application. Claims 2, 3, 4, 10-14, and 16-18 have been amended. Claims 1, 8, 9, and 21 are being cancelled herewith.

In item 2 on page 2 of the above-identified Office action, claims 8 and 9 have been rejected as being indefinite under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

As noted above, claims 8 and 9 have been cancelled. Therefore, the rejection of claims 8 and 9 has been overcome.

It is accordingly believed that the claims meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Should the Examiner find any further objectionable items, counsel would appreciate a telephone call during which the matter may be resolved. The above-noted changes to the claims are provided solely for cosmetic or clarificatory reasons. The changes are not provided for overcoming the prior art nor for any reason related to the statutory requirements for a patent.

Applic. No. 10/689,973

Amdt. dated June 6, 2006

Reply to Office action of March 8, 2006

In item 3 on page 3 of the Office action, claims 1, 3, 9-14, 16-18, and 21 have been rejected as being fully anticipated by Fujimoto (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0011509 A1) under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

In item 4 on page 6 of the Office action, claim 15 has been rejected as being obvious over Fujimoto (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0011509 A1) under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

It is appreciatively noted from item 5 on page 7 of the Office action that claims 19 and 20 are allowed and that claims 2 and 4-7 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 1 and 21 have been cancelled. The remaining claims have been amended to depend from allowable claim 19. Therefore, claims 2-7, 10-18, and 20 are allowable as well.

Since only allowable claims remain, the early issuance of a Notice of Allowance is solicited herewith.

In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, counsel respectfully requests a telephone

Applic. No. 10/689,973

Amdt. dated June 6, 2006

Reply to Office action of March 8, 2006

call so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out.

If an extension of time for this paper is required, petition for extension is herewith made.

Please charge any other fees which might be due with respect to Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner Greenberg Stemer LLP, No. 12-1099.

Respectfully submitted,



For Applicant(s)

Alfred K. Dassler
52,794

AKD:cgm

June 6, 2006

Lerner Greenberg Stemer LLP
Post Office Box 2480
Hollywood, FL 33022-2480
Tel: (954) 925-1100
Fax: (954) 925-1101